arXiv:gr-qc/9404039v1 19 Apr 1994

Black Hole Entropy and Induced Gravity

Ted Jacobson
Dept. Physics, Univ. of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-4111

Abstract

In this short essay we review the arguments showing that black hole entropy is, at least in part, "entanglement entropy", i.e., missing information contained in correlations between quantum field fluctuations inside and outside the event horizon. Although the entanglement entropy depends upon the matter field content of the theory, it turns out that so does the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy $A/4\hbar G_{ren}$, in precisely the same way, because the effective gravitational constant G_{ren} is renormalized by the very same quantum fluctuations. It appears most satisfactory if the entire gravitational action is "induced", in the manner suggested by Sakharov, since then the black hole entropy is purebred entanglement entropy, rather than being hybrid with bare gravitational entropy (whatever that might be.)

That the area of a classical black hole event horizon cannot decrease[1] is reminiscent of the second law of thermodynamics. Black hole analogs of the zeroth, first, and third laws of thermodynamics also exist[2], with the surface gravity κ playing the role of temperature. This analogy gave rise to the idea that the area is really a measure of entropy[3] It is the behavior of quantum fields in the black hole spacetime that finally elevates the thermodynamic analogy to an identity. Hawking's demonstration[4] that a black hole in fact radiates quanta at the temperature $T_H = \hbar\kappa/2\pi$ transforms the surface gravity into a true temperature, and fixes the coefficient of the entropy, $A/4\hbar G$. However, the statistical nature of the black hole entropy remains to be clarified.

When one thinks of entropy as missing information, it seems rather natural for an event horizon to have an associated entropy, since a horizon certainly hides information[3]. But what is the nature of this missing information, and why does classical general relativity know about it? In this essay I will recap what is known about this puzzle, including some very recent developments. I will argue that all indications point to the following answer: the missing information is that contained in correlations between

quantum field fluctuations inside and outside the event horizon, and the reason that classical general relativity knows about this is that the gravitational dynamics is governed by an action that is "induced" by those same quantum fluctuations, as suggested originally by Sakharov[5].

Our starting point is the observation that, while the Hawking radiation from a black hole appears thermal from outside the horizon, in fact the global state of the quantum fields being radiated is pure. It is only when the degrees of freedom beyond the horizon are ignored that the state appears as a mixed, thermal one. I will call the entropy of this exterior thermal state "entanglement entropy".

The idea the black hole entropy might arise partly or entirely from just such entanglement entropy meets with an immediate difficulty. In continuum quantum field theory, the entanglement entropy is *infinite*, on account of the singular correlations in the vacuum fluctuations at pairs of points on either side of the horizon[6, 7]. However, if there is a physical short distance cutoff on the quantum field degrees of freedom, one obtains instead a finite entropy. Moreover, if the cutoff is chosen as the Planck length, one gets an entropy of the same order of magnitude as the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. Thus, in fact, one might argue that black hole thermodynamics *demands* such a fundamental cutoff[6, 7, 8].

This regularization of the divergence in the entropy appears to lead to another problem, however, which I will call the "species problem". Namely, if the cutoff is fixed at the Planck length L_{Pl}, then the entanglement entropy depends on the number of independent quantum fields, whereas the black hole entropy $A/4L_{Pl}^2$ appears not to. Of course one could always adjust the cutoff "by hand" so as to recover the usual black hole entropy, however this would be totally artifical.

Different resolutions of the species problem have been proposed. It has been suggested that the whole theory may be consistent only for a particular spectrum of physical fields[6, 9], or that the effective cutoff length may, for dynamical reasons, depend upon the number of species[6, 7, 10]. It appears however that the most straightforward resolution is to keep the fundamental cutoff fixed, but to recognize that the Planck length itself depends upon the number of species. While this idea at first sounds mysterious and vague, and seems to invoke some unknown dynamics of quantum gravity, in fact it only requires quantum field theory in a fixed background spacetime in order to be understood.

The point is that the effective gravitational constant G is renormalized by the very same quantum fluctuations that are giving rise to the entanglement entropy[11]. It turns out that this renormalization acts in just the right way to yield the formula $A/4\hbar G_{ren}$ for the black hole entropy, independent of the number of fields or the form of their interactions. That is, although the entanglement entropy indeed depends upon the field content of the theory, so does the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, in precisely the same way.

Here I will just sketch the line of reasoning leading to this conclusion. For simplicity let us assume the black hole is static (i.e. stationary and nonrotating), and let us work with the eternal black hole spacetime, i.e. the maximal analytic extension (the Kruskal extension in the Schwarzschild case). The use of the eternal black hole background here is intended as an idealization that simplifies the analysis. The significant conclusions should apply as well to the case of a black hole that forms from collapse. The quantum state $|0\rangle$ of the (possibly interacting, generic,) quantum field ϕ is taken to be the unique one that is time-independent and regular everywhere on the extended spacetime including the horizon. In the Schwarzschild case this state is the Hartle-Hawking "vacuum".

The field degrees of freedom can be partitioned into those in region I, "outside" the horizon, and those in region II, "inside" the horizon. (For the eternal black hole regions I and II are in fact isometric.) Tracing over the field degrees of freedom behind the horizon, we obtain the reduced density matrix $\rho_I \equiv \mathrm{tr}_{II}|0\rangle\langle 0|$, which describes a *mixed* state rather than a pure one, due to the entanglement of the degrees of freedom in regions I and II in the state $|0\rangle$. Rather remarkably, it turns out that this reduced density matrix can also be expressed as $\rho_I = \mathcal{N}\exp(-\beta H)$, where β is the inverse Hawking temperature $2\pi/\hbar\kappa$, H is the hamiltonian that generates the time translation symmetry outside the horizon, and $\mathcal{N}$ is a normalization factor. (Various aspects or cases of this relation have been derived, e.g., in [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18].) That is, the reduced density matrix is simply proportional to the density matrix for the canonical thermal ensemble at the Hawking temperature, defined with repect to the hamiltonian of the static observers outside the black hole horizon. In particular, the entanglement entropy is precisely the same as the thermal entropy of this ensemble. In terms of the partition function $Z[\beta] = \mathrm{tr}\exp(-\beta H)$, the entanglement entropy $-\mathrm{tr}\rho_I \ln \rho_I$ can thus be expressed as the thermal entropy $(1 - \beta\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta})\ln Z$.

To establish the relation between this thermal entropy and the Bekenstein-

Hawking entropy, one can express the partition function $Z[\beta]$ as a functional integral over fields on the static Euclidean black hole geometry, with $\hbar\beta$ being the period of the Euclidean time coordinate[11, 15]. The general covariance of the matter action implies that the result, $Z = Z[g_{ab}]$, is a generally covariant functional of the black hole metric g_{ab}. The effective action $W = -\hbar \ln Z$ has both local and non-local contributions. For the local part W_{loc}, a curvature expansion can be written down:

$$W_{loc} = \hbar \int d^4x\sqrt{g}\Big[a_0 + a_1 R + a_2 R^2 + a_2' R^{ab}R_{ab} + ...\Big].$$

The coefficients a_0, a_1 and a_2 generically diverge in four spacetime dimensions. They can be rendered finite by imposing a short distance cutoff L_c on the field fluctuations[1], yielding $a_0 \sim L_c^{-4}$, $a_1 \sim L_c^{-2}$, and $a_2 \sim \ln L_c$. We have already seen that such a cutoff is in any case required in order to avoid an infinite contribution to the entropy.

Now the entanglement entropy receives contributions from the entire effective action, including the nonlocal parts. Most of these contributions are state-dependent. However, the contribution from the most singular part of W_{loc} is universal for states with the same short distance structure. The cosmological constant term a_0 yields no contribution, so the leading contribution comes from the Einstein-Hilbert term $\hbar a_1 \int d^4x\sqrt{g}R$. Since the metric g_{ab} is time-independent, the volume contribution to the action will simply be proportional to β, so will not contribute to the entropy. In fact, the only contribution to the entropy made by W_{loc} comes from the horizon, where a conical singularity is introduced when β is varied away from $2\pi/\hbar\kappa$. This contribution is given by $4\pi\hbar a_1 A$, where A is the area of the horizon[19, 11]. (Note we do not need to assume the black hole is a stationary point of the effective action to arrive at this conclusion.) This is of the same form as the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, with $\hbar a_1$ in place of $(1/16\pi G)$.[2]

[1] If the cutoff breaks general covariance, then one should no longer expect the effective action to contain only generally covariant terms. (I thank R.C. Myers for pointing this out.) Still, for background metrics that are slowly varying on the scale of the cutoff, the generally covariant terms should dominate.

[2] The higher curvature terms in W_{loc} yield (state-dependent) contributions to the entropy that appear to be naturally asociated with the horizon as well. A powerful technology for computing these contributions has recently been developed[20] and applied[21, 22] to a wide class of higher curvature terms. (See also [23] for similar results obtained by a different method.)

In other words, the entanglement entropy of the quantum fields will always contribute to the renormalized Bekenstein-Hawking entropy $A/4\hbar G_{ren}$ in proportion to their contribution to the renormalized inverse gravitational constant $1/G_{ren}$ in the effective action. This is true independent of their number and the nature of their interactions.

If the entire gravitational action were induced, then *all* of the black hole entropy would be entanglement entropy. This would appear much more natural than if it were a hybrid of entanglement entropy and "bare gravitational entropy" (whatever that is.) Whether an induced gravity theory is a discrete pregeometric dynamics with an intrinsic cutoff(see, e.g., [24, 25, 26]), or a superstring theory (as suggested in this context in [11]), or something yet entirely different, it receives a stamp of approval from black hole thermodynamics and Occam's razor.

I would like to thank B.L. Hu and R.C. Myers for illuminating discussions and valuable suggestions on the manuscript, and especially J.Z. Simon for extensive helpful discussions. This work was supported by NSF grant PHY91-12240.

References

[1] S.W. Hawking, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **25** (1972) 152

[2] J.M. Bardeen, B. Carter and S.W. Hawking, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **31** (1973) 161.

[3] J.D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 2333 (1973); Phys. Rev. D **9**, 3292 (1974).

[4] S.W. Hawking, Nature **248**, 30 (1974); Comm. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975).

[5] A.D. Sakharov, *Sov. Phys. Doklady* **12** 1040 (1968).

[6] R.D. Sorkin, in *General Relativity and Gravitation*, proceedings of the GR10 Conference, Padova 1983, ed. B. Bertotti, F. de Felice, A. Pascolini (Consiglio Nazionale della Ricerche, Roma, 1983) Vol. 2.

[7] L. Bombelli, R.K. Koul, J. Lee and R.D. Sorkin, *Phys. Rev.* **D34** (1986) 373.

[8] G. 't Hooft, *Nucl. Phys.* **B256** (1985) 727.

[9] G. 't Hooft, talk at Conference on Quantum Aspects of Black Holes, Santa Barbara, June 24, 1993.

[10] V. Frolov and I. Novikov, *Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993) 4545.

[11] L. Susskind and J. Uglum, Stanford preprint SU-ITP-94-1, hep-th/9401070.

[12] B.S. DeWitt, *Phys. Rep.* **19C** (1975) 297.

[13] G.W. Gibbons and M.J. Perry, Phys. Rev. Lett. **36**, 985 (1976); Proc. Roy. Soc. A **358**, 467 (1978).

[14] W.G. Unruh and N. Weiss, Phys. Rev. D **29**, 1656 (1984).

[15] D. Kabat and M.J. Strassler, Rutgers preprint RU-94-10, hep-th/9401125.

[16] C. Callan and F. Wilczek, IAS preprint IASSNS-HEP-93/87, hep-th/9401072.

[17] A.O. Barvinsky, V.P. Frolov and A.I. Zelnikov, Alberta preprint, gr-qc/9404036.

[18] T. Jacobson, in preparation.

[19] M. Bañados, C. Teitelboim, and J. Zanelli, IAS preprint IASSNS-HEP-93-53, gr-qc/93120002.

[20] R.M. Wald, *Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993) R3427.

[21] T. Jacobson, G. Kang and R.C. Myers, McGill preprint 93-22, gr-qc/9312023.

[22] V. Iyer and R.M. Wald, Chicago preprint, gr-qc/9403028.

[23] M. Visser, *Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993) 5697.

[24] G. 't Hooft, in *Recent Developments in Gravitation, Cargese 1978*, ed. M. Levy and S. Deser (Plenum, New York, 1979).

[25] L. Bombelli, J. Lee, D. Meyer, and R.D. Sorkin, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **59** (1987) 521.

[26] Y. Shamir, Weizmann preprint WIS-94/10-Feb-PH, hep-th/9402109.